INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

	Page
Defense' Witnesses	
TANAKA, Shinichi (resumed)	20705
Cross by Mr. Tavenner	20705
MORNING RECESS	20725
Cross by Mr. Tavenner (cont'd)	20726
Redirect by Mr. Brooks Redirect by Mr. BANNO (cont'd)	20736 20742
(Witness excused)	20744
NOON RECESS	20744
KAWABE, Terashire (recalled)	20745
Direct by Mr. Levin	20745
(Witness excused)	20771
	20772
SHIBAYAMA, Kaneshiro Direct by Mr. Levin	20772
AFTERNOON RECESS	20775
Direct by Mr. Levin (cont od)	20775
Cross by Mr. Sutton	20780
(Witness excused)	20/81
Direct by Mr. Levin (Witness excused)	20781

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

No. No.		Description	For Ident.	Evidence
225 248	,	Affidavit of KAWABE, Torashiro		20746
1132 2490)	Affidavit of SHIBAYAMA Kaneshiro	,	20774
972 2493	1	Affidavit of ISHIKAWA,	Jun	20782
1157 2493	2	Gertificate of Telegram dispatched in conne- with the Settlement the North China Inc	of of	20793
1158 249	3	Ditto		20793
1159 249	4	Ditte		20793

Thursday, 24 April 1947 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal
War Ministry Building
Tokyo, Japan The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, at 0930. Appearances: For the Tribunal, same as before. For the Presecution Section, same as before. For the Defense Section, same as before. (English to Japanese and Japanese to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, IMTFE.)

Groonbore & Borton

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: All the accused are present except TOGO and HIRANUMA who are represented by counsel. The surgeon of Sugamo Prison certifies that TOGO and HIRANUMA are too ill to attend the trial today. The certificate will be recorded and filed.

There is a request for corrections by Judge Nyi. The record page 20,663, on the fifth line, substitute "while" for "why"; and on the ninth line, substitute "while" for "why."

Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENMER: I desire to be permitted to cross-examine this witness.

SHINICHI TANAKA, called as a witness
on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and
testified through Japanese interpreters as
follows:

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. TAVENNER:

Q General TANAKA, you testified that you occupied the post of Chief of the Military Affairs Section, War Service Bureau, War Ministry. What is the War Service Bureau of the War Ministry?

Greenbore & Borton

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: All the accused are present except TOGO and HIRANUMA who are represented by counsel. The surgeon of Sugamo Prison certifies that TOGO and HIRANUMA are too ill to attend the trial today. The certificate will be recorded and filed.

There is a request for corrections by Judge Nyi. The record page 20,663, on the fifth line, substitute "while" for "why"; and on the ninth line, substitute "while" for "why."

Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: I desire to be permitted to cross-examine this witness.

SHINICHI TANAKA, called as a witness
on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and
testified through Japanese interpreters as
follows:

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. TAVENNER:

Q General TANAKA, you testified that you occupied the post of Chief of the Military Affairs Section, War Service Bureau, War Ministry. What is the War Service Bureau of the War Ministry?

A The War Service Bureau is one of the departments of the War Ministry.

Q What is its function?

A The principal functions of the War Service
Bureau are in charge of the army forces, that is,

Bureau are in charge of the army forces, that is, organization of the military forces -- the army forces, matters regarding to their equipment, mobilization of troops, replacement of troops, and policy with regard to national defense.

Q Prior to the time you accepted this post and, say, during the year 1936, what positions did you hold? Confine your answer to the year 1936.

A I was not Chief of the Military Affairs Section. I was Chief of the War Service Section of the Military Affairs Bureau.

Q I understood that, but my present question is, what position did you hold prior to that time; that is, prior to March, 1937?

A Prior to March 1937 I served as Chief of the Military Service Section for about one year.

THE PRESIDENT: I suppose you have some reason for asking this.

MR. TAVENNER: It may or may not have relevancy, your Honor, depending upon what answers appear later.

6

1

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

13

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q You testified, on page 3 of your affidavit, that a plan of operation against China could not be realized by the General Staff without the approval and cooperation of the War Ministry. What do you mean by this statement?

A The contents of the operation plans includes the strength of the forces and the materials
necessary for the forces -- for the operations. This
is because the matters concerning the strength of
the forces and materials necessary for the operations is a function of the War Ministry.

And by that you mean that, unless the War Ministry cooperates and functions with the General Staff, it would be impossible to carry out a plan of operations?

A It has two meanings: that they would not be able to draft operational plans or to carry out the operational plans.

Q That means that plans could not even be made without their approval, cooperation and functioning?

A Yes, that is so.

Q At the time of the Marco Polo Bridge Incident, what was the fighting strength of the Japanese division?

A I believe that the strength of a division

in peace time was between ten and twelve thousand.

Q That being true, the two hundred divisions that you testified to would amount to about two hundred thousand troops instead of twenty million troops as stated in your affidavit at the bottom of page 3.

THE PRESIDENT: That refers to the Chinese Army.

MR. TAVENNER: My question related to the Chinese Army, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. That makes out that there are one hundred thousand troops in each division.

MR. TAVENNER: Yes, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: It should be "two million," not "twenty million." No nation has had an army of twenty million, and many have had more than two hundred divisions.

Q (Continuing) I withdraw the question.

It was an error in your affidavit to state
"twenty million," was it not?

A I did not say "twenty million." I said "two million."

THE PRESIDENT: The copy of the affidavit has "twenty million," but we will close the debate

8

2

3

10

11

12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

21

22

24

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

23

24

25

"two million."

in peace time was between ten and twelve thousand. That being true, the two hundred divisions that you testified to would amount to about two hundred thousand troops instead of twenty million troops as stated in your affidavit at the bottom of page 3. THE PRESIDENT: That refers to the Chinese Army. MR. TAVENNER: My question related to the Chinese Army, your Honor. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. That makes out that there are one hundred thousand troops in each division. MR. TAVENNER: Yes, sir. THE PRESIDENT: It should be "two million," not "twenty million." No nation has had an army 16 of twenty million, and many have had more than two 17 18 hundred divisions. (Continuing) I withdraw the question. 19 It was an error in your affidavit to state 20 21 "twenty million," was it not? I did not say "twenty million." I said 22

THE PRESIDENT: The copy of the affidavit

has "twenty million," but we will close the debate

on it.

Q You testified on page 4 of your affidavit that the USSR had a peace time standing army in the Far East which included 45 cavalry divisions.

A I did not say -- I did not testify "45 divisions"; I said "4 point 5 divisions."

MR. TAVENNER: I would like the record, then, to be corrected accordingly.

THE PRESIDENT: The copy says "45."

A (Continuing) I should like to state also at this time that during the reading of my affidavit yesterday I noticed, in addition to these mistakes, several other errors. May I be permitted to point these out?

Q Yes, I would like to know what they are.

A The first of these -- I believe it was the third paragraph during the reading yesterday. In my affidavit I meant -- I testified that the decision of the government's policy was made about -- either about -- on the 7th or 8th of July. If I recall correctly, this portion was read "either in July or August."

Q What decision are you referring to?

A What I meant by "decision" was the policy which the government adopted at that time of non-

2

1

5

7

8

9

10

12

13 14

15

16 17

> 18 19

20

21

23

aggrandizement of the incident. But, in view of the fact that -- non-enlargement policy of the government. But, in view of the fact that conditions on the spot were not very clear, they would have to take measures -- due measures for self defense. However, the increase of enemy -- of troops, and the decision, also, was to send enforcement -- was not adopted.

Q Are you attempting to correct a date of when the decision was reached?

A I desire to correct this point because it refers to the month, not the day. It was read, I believe, according to the month of July or August. The correct one is the date 8th or 9th -- 7th or 8th.

Q Are there any other corrections?

A Yes. The next is in connection with the Captain OYAMA incident. I believe, in the affidavit it was read that the incident took place on the 10th of August when the Chief of the First Section of the Navy Office came to the War Ministry to -- for liaison. I believe the date read -- the year read yesterday said "1932." It should be "1937."

Q Any other corrections?

A That is all.

25

reached?

What was the source of your information regarding the alleged strength of Russian troops? A The source of my information is -- are those -- are information which were gathered by 4 the Staff Office. The Staff Office in Tokyo? 6 7 Yes. A You do not know the source of the Staff Office's information, do you? A I do not know that. You state that it was concluded that it 11 would be dangerous and undesirable to carry out 12 13 operations in China in the light of the military strength of the USSR. When was that conclusion 14 15 reached? 16 THE MONITOR: Mr. Tavenner, you stated 17 "conclusion"? 18 MR. TAVENNER: Yes. 19 THE MONITOR: Which conclusion are you 20 referring to? 21 MR. TAVENNER: The only one I referred to 22 was the conclusion that it was concluded to be danger-23

A This conclusion was reached whether an inci-

ous. I have asked now, when was that conclusion

dent broke out or not. I believe it was just after the outbreak of the Harco Polo Incident.

Now, as a matter of fact, Japan had entered into a treaty with Germany by which they made a military alliance against Russia in November, 1936, did it not?

MR. LEVIN: We object to that as not coming within the scope of the affidavit.

THE PRESIDENT: It is arguable, but I think it is within the scope of the affidavit. The objection is overruled.

A I shall reply to that question. I do not know whether such a treaty -- military alliance was signed in 1937 or not, but I do know that no military alliance was signed -- directed at the Soviet Union -- a Japanese-German alliance directed against the Soviet Union.

MR. TAVENNER: I understand there was a mistake in translation of the year. My question was 1936.

Q Do you not recall that, as a result of the secret treaty attached to the Anti-Comintern Pact, Japan took the position that Russia must consider that it, from thenceforth on, faced both Germany and Japan; that is, that it would be faced from that

time by

THE PRESIDENT: That is really a matter for argument later, Mr. Tavenner. You are really inviting him to indulge with you in an argument. You may test his credibility in that way, but I doubt it.

MR. TAVENNFR: Well, then, I would like to ask one different question along a somewhat similar line.

Q Now, was it not also concluded that it was dangerous to attack the Soviet Union without first subduing the forces of the National Government of China?

A I did not understand that question very well.

I should like to have it repeated once more.

THE PRESIDENT: The Japanese reporter will repeat it.

(Whereupon, the last question was read by the Japanese court reporter.)

A (Continuing) The conclusion was not that the Chinese -- the forces of the National Government should be subdued before -- and by subduing the forces of the National Government, and taking up the matters -- that is, facing the Soviet Union. That was not the conclusion reached. The conclusion was that, to carry on a full scale war against China was --

in July, 1937, the General Staff gave an explanation in which it was stated that there should be an immediate settlement of the incident. Was that explanation made before directions were given to conduct negotiations with the Hopei-Chahar political group?

⚠ What do you mean by the "Hopei-Chahar Government"?

The negotiations with the Hopei-Chahar Regime began immediately after the outbreak of the Lukuochiao Incident. Therefore, the explanation of the General Staff to seek immediate settlement of the incident was conducted parallel with the negotiations with the Hopei-Chahar Government.

Duda & Whalen

Q Then I notice by that statement, or that explanation, that it was considered that a head-on, protracted war between Japan and China is liable to occur. What justification was there for that conclusion immediately upon the happening of the incident?

A I believe I did not say that there was a possibility of such a possibility. I believe I testified in my affidavit that there was misgivings that such an event -- such a situation might arise.

The exact language used by you was that "the present incident is liable to turn into a head-on, protracted war . . . " Now you say that that explanation was made before negotiations were attempted.

A The explanation was made that at the same time that negotiations were being conducted on the spct, that there was the possibility of a head-on collision.

Q You were thinking in the terms of an all-out war with China even as early as July 8th and 9th, were you not?

A It is not that I had such ideas, but I testified in my affidavit that the general staff office felt that way -- explained it that way.

Then as early as November 11th action was taken by the Japanese Government to send troops from

Japan to China. That is correct, it is not?

A The 11th of November is not correct; the date is the 11th of July.

Q I am certain I said the 11th of July.

I stand corrected. It should be the 11th of July, of course.

A The troops dispatched on the 11th of July were not sent from Japan, that is, the homeland, Japan proper, but were forces from the army in Korea and in Manchuria.

THE MONITOR: Part of the forces in Manchuria and China were dispatched.

Q Then you immediately sent down forces from Korea and Manchuria. But at the same time didn't you replenish those troops in Manchuria and Korea by sending an equivalent number from Japan?

A No replacements were made to the forces in Korea or Manchuria.

Q I refer you to page 16 of your affidavit, section IX, in which you state: "About the expenditures of our expeditionary forces which were sent to Korea and Manchuria on July 11, 1937, I was asked by my superiors," and so forth.

Do you still state that troops were not sent from Japan to Korea and Manchuria?

5

1

3

8

7

9

11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

5

7

6

8

11

10

12 13

14

16 17

18

19

22

21

23 24

25

A The expenditures mentioned were the expenditures necessary for our forces which were dispatched from Korea and Manchuria as expenditures in North China of these troops which were dispatched from Korea and Manchuria.

THE PRESIDENT: They are called expeditionary forces and they are alleged to have gone to Korea. And he has not made any correction, although he did correct other parts of the affidavit.

Q Every opportunity was given you to make any corrections you desired to this statement, and you appeared to have given careful attention to the matter of corrections.

A I did not refer to any expeditionary forces in my affidavit. I wonder what passage is referred to.

THE PRESIDENT: Look at the original in Japanese.

MR. TAVENNER: Will the Marshal show him the original?

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

THE PRESIDENT: And let the Language Section look at it. Section IX on page 16 of the English copy.

THE WITNESS: Where is the passage that refers

to an expeditionary force?

THE PRESIDENT: Section IX.

Q It is item IX, section or paragraph IX, in the second sentence.

A Yes, I know. May I read this passage? THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

A "About the expenditures of our forces which were sent to Korea and Manchuria on July 11, 1937, I was asked by my superiors in the War Ministry--"
Correction: "About the expenditures of our forces which were sent from Korea and Manchuria on July 11, 1937, I was asked by my superiors in the War Ministry to negotiate with the Finance Ministry with a view to meet current expenses with a reserve fund," and so forth.

THE PRESIDENT: The word "expeditionary" does not appear in the Japanese, and the word "from" where "to" appears in the copies we have.

Now, let Major Moore see the original. Major Moore.

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Major Moore): Mr. President, the proper translation should be: "About the expenditures of our forces in Korea and Manchuria dispatched on July 11th . . ."

There is an explanation, sir, for the

7

1

2

3

10

12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

mistranslation, but I don't think that it will help the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: Dispatched from where?

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Major Moore): The original does not say, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: Our forces in Korea dispatched on a certain date?

THE WITNESS: It does not refer to the forces in Korea; it means the forces which were dispatched from Korea and Manchuria to North China.

Q Then may I ask you whether or not any troops were dispatched from Japan to Manchuria and Korea in the month of July '37, or to China in the month of July '37?

A When the troops in Japan were mobilized on the 27th of July I believe troops were sent from Japan to China.

- Q Was that on the 27th of July?
- A Yes, July the 27th.
- Q How many divisions?
- A Three divisions.
- Q On page 13 of your affidavit you refer to four divisions having been dispatched. What became of the other division?

A I did not in my affidavit state that four divisions were dispatched; I said three divisions.

1

3

5

7 8

9

10

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

21

22

24

I am reading from your affidavit, the last sentence in paragraph H on page 13, in which you use the words "say roughly 4 divisions in July." Now, which of your statements are we to believe: your statement that there were only three divisions, or roughly four divisions?

A The troops dispatched from Japan on the 27th of July was definitely three divisions.

Q Well, I am asking you what became of the fourth division that you said was dispatched? Where did it go?

THE PRESIDENT: There doesn't seem to be much in it, but let Major Moore tell us what the original said.

Q You testified, page 6 of your afficavit, that the chief of staff of the army at the front was notified on July 8 through the vice-chief of the General Staff, of the decision regarding the general policy of non-enlargement of the incident. Now, who was the chief of staff of the army in the field?

A You mean the chief of staff .t the front?

Q Yes.

A I believe that the chief of staff at the front was Lieutenant General HASHIMOTO, Gun.

Q And who was the vice-chief of the General Staff?

A The vice-chief of the General Staff was

3

6

7 8

9

10

12

13 14

16

17

15

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

Lieutenant General IMAI, Kiyoshi.

Q You say you knew of these things from documents. Where are those documents?

A What I mean by referring to documents is the telegram sent by the vice-chief of staff; the original was circulated among us after it had been sent. I learned it from looking at the original -- the circular of the original.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Moore.

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Major Moore): Mr. President, the statement on page 13, paragraph H, bottom of the paragraph, is definitely "4 divisions in July, 7 divisions in August, and 4 divisions in September and October," according to the original.

THE WITNESS: I shall explain that. The four divisions, roughly four divisions mentioned there, include the three divisions sent from Japan on the 27th of July and the one division sent from Korea on the 11th of July, making a total of four.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we don't want to hear anything more about it. There is very little in it.

Q You testified, page 7 of the affidavit, that you know from accuments of the order of July 9 from the General Staff to the army at the front, directing negotiations with the Hopei-Chahar Political Committee for

9

10

8

2

4

11

13

16 17

15

18

19

21

22

20

23 24

4 5

7 8

settlement. To what documents are you referring, and why have you not produced them?

A The documents at that time -- it has been accepted custom or procedure in such official or routine matters that the original of the telegram be circulated among those who are concerned after it had been dispatched. The original was circulated in those sections where it was considered necessary.

Q Why were directions given to negotiate with the Hopei-Chahar Political Committee?

A This matter was not one of my direct functions and I do not know very definitely about it, but I believe that in view of the fact that immediate settlement was sought, it would be better to conduct negotiations directly, on the spot. And I further believe that the Hopei-Chahar regime at that time possessed the authority and the ability to settle an incident of this nature.

Wasn't the chief consideration that motivated you, or the Japanese Government, the fact that SAKURAI, who was with the Japanese headquarters garrison army, was the adviser to that political group and was also the adviser to the Chinese Army at the same time?

A I do not know or I am not well informed on this point. I do not know very clearly.

to negotiate with the national government on this

1 2

Matter, do you not?

A I believe it is natural that in view of the fact that the order was sent to the Japanese forces in North China, that is, the local authorities -- army in North China, it was only natural that they would conduct negotiations with the local Chinese authori-

You do know that no directions were given

ties; in other words, the Hopei-Chahar regime.

Q You do know, as a matter of fact, that the Chinese Foreign Minister on July 12 proposed to the Japanese that mutual concessions be made on this matter, do you not?

A I believe that I had heard something of that sort, but since it was no concern of mine, that is, not closely related to my duties, I do not know definitely.

Q You seem to have very definite recollection and information regarding the Hopei-Chahar political group; why is it you don't know anything about the Nanking Government?

A My work and my duties were such that I
was primarily concerned -- that is, quite interested in
what was going on with regard to the Hopei-Chahar
regime because it was a matter for the military to have

Government.

very great concern in. The negotiation with the central government in Nanking is a matter for the government with regard to political affairs and diplomatic affairs; and, therefore, as far as I was concerned, I was not familiar with the nature of this, so therefore 5 I do not know about the negotiations with the Nanking

Q Do you know whether there were negotiations conducted at any time between the Japanese Government and the Nanking Government after the proposal made on the 12th by the Chinese ambassador?

I heard at that time that negotiations were conducted with the government in Nanking on about the 18th or 19th of July.

The matter to which you now refer was a letter from the Nanking Government, was it not, in which they suggested settlement by diplomatic means and withdrawal of the troops of both sides to their original positions?

I did not see anything that would give me an idea as to contents of such a letter. I merely said that I had heard that such negotiations took place on about the 18th or 19th.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was

2 4

> 6 7

8 9

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

24

25

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE MONITOR: The witness' previous statement should be corrected as follows:

"I have never seen such a letter, but I have heard such a proposition was made.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

BY MR. TAVENNER (Continued):

Q Do you know whether there were any negotiations from the Japanese side after the receipt of that letter from the Nanking Government?

A No, I do not.

Q You have testified regarding the terms of the proposed settlement between the army and the Hopei-Chahar political committee. Were other terms considered or proposed by the Japanese Government?

A I have heard that the Japanese Government made overtures to the Government in Nanking that the Chinese side cease immediately any warlike activities and that Nanking not interfere in North China in the progress, that is, negotiations for a local settlement in North China.

Q That was the communication which gave rise

to the letter from the Nanking Government to which I have just referred, was it not?

A Yes, I believe so.

Q I am asking you now if there was not another consideration taken into account by the Japanese Government with regard to a proposed settlement such as recognition of Manchukuo by China?

A I have not heard of that, and, further, I do not believe that such a thing happened -- proposal was made.

Q My question may have been misleading on that point. I meant to ask you whether or not the Japanese Government considered making such a proposal.

A I have no recollection of such a fact; further, in view of my duties as Chief of the War Service Section in the War Ministry I was busy both night and day, and I had no time to think of such matters.

Q Did you also hear of a suggestion that there be a military alliance between China and Japan as one of the conditions of a settlement?

A I have not heard of anything like a military alliance -- proposal for a military alliance. If such a proposal for a military alliance was made I believe that I would have had wind of it somehow or

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

other, but I did not at any time.

Q Was USHIROKU the Chief of the Military
Affairs Bureau at this time?

THE MONITOR: Will you spell out the name, please?

PR. TAVENNER: U-S-H-I-R-O-K-U.

A Yes.

Q Was he your superior?

A Yes.

Q Near the bottom of page 7 of your affidavit -- strike that question.

You refer to Chinese authorities ordering four divisions of the central army stationed near Suchow to march toward the frontiers of Honan Province -- this does appear near the bottom of page 7 of your affidavit -- and in the same paragraph you refer to the illegal firing continuing near Marco Polo Bridge. By that do you mean that the ordering of the Chinese divisions to march toward the frontier occurred at the same time as the firing that you spoke of in the latter part of the paragraph?

A I heard from information from the General Staff office that the ordering of four Chinese divisions of the central army near Suchow to march toward the frontier, and illegal firing near the

2'

3

5

6

8

9

10

12

13 14

16

17

18

20

21

23 24

Marco Polo Bridge occurred about the same time, that is, that occurred successively.

Q What do you mean by "successively"?

A With regard to the time element, I don't know whether the two occurred at the same time, but I believe or I recall that these two occurred about the 10th.

Marco Polo Bridge occurred about the same time, that is, that occurred successively.

Q What do you mean by "successively"?

A With regard to the time element, I don't know whether the two occurred at the same time, but I believe or I recall that these two occurred about the 10th.

Q Then it is your statement that the order for the movement of troops was given on or about the 10th of July?

A Yes, it was about -- approximately the 10th of July.

Q Then on the next page of your affidavit you state that as a result of this situation a decision was made to dispatch troops immediately to the Peiping-Tientsin area. In other words, are you contending that the action of sending troops on July 11 from Manchuria and Korea was based upon this troop movement that you have described?

A In view of the fact that the life and property of Japanese nationals in the Peiping-Tientsin area were endangered as a result of this act on the part of the Chinese the government issued on the 11th of July a statement of policy and in accordance with this statement the decision to dispatch troops from Korea and Manchuria was made.

Q You state in your affidavit that as a result of the reinforcement of Chinese troops in North China the lives of the residents were becoming endangered and that that was the reason you took this action?

A As a result of the reinforcement of the Chinese troops in North China the position of the

3 4 5

1

6

8

10

11

13

14

15 16

18

19

17

20

22

24

Japanese garrison troops in the Tientsin-Peiping area would become dangerous -- became, that is, in danger; and as a result of this fact the lives and property of the Japanese nationals were in utmost danger and in view of this fact the decision was made to increase the barest minimum of troops to North China.

THE MONITOR: "To North China" should be deleted.

Furthermore, in view of the fact that the Chinese troops in the Peiping-Tientsin area were very strongly anti-Japanese in their sentiment therefore the lives and property of the Japanese nationals in that area would be faced with extreme danger -- there was a danger that there would be a critical situation arising with regard to the lives and property of the Japanese nationals in that area, and also because of the fact that the strength of the Japanese forces garrisonod in the Tientsin-Peiping area numbered, I believe, between six and seven thousand at that time while the Chinese troops in that area without reinforcements already totaled between fifty and sixty thousand. We had received information that the Chinese in that area even without reinforcements numbered somewhere between fifty and sixty thousand.

3

5

7 8

9

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

Q Now, what is the basis in fact for your statement that Chinese divisions were being marched north on July 10?

A They are based on information gathered by the General Staff.

Q As a matter of fact do you not know that no Chinese troops were sent north until after the action of the Japanese government on July 11 to send troops to China and after, in fact, troops had been sent on July 11 from Manchuria and Korea to North China?

A That is not so. Even prior -- that is prior to the decision of the Japanese Government to send reinforcements or troops to North China the General Staff had gathered information that the Central Government troops had been ordered to march northward.

I repeat: Prior to the decision by the Japanese Government on the 11th of July to send troops to North China the General Staff had gathered information that the Central Government troops had been ordered to march northward.

Q How far was the border of Honan Province from Peiping?

A I do not know definitely.

Q Three hundred to five hundred miles, would

you say?

A I don't believe that it was that far.

Q Do you know that when troops were finally sent by the Nanking government north that they were stopped at Paoting, P-a-o-t-i-n-g, where they were held voluntarily by the Chinese authorities?

A Yes, I heard of it but the time that I heard of it was much later than when it actually happened, but I did not know at that time whether this act was made voluntarily by the Chinese authorities or was made for any other reason.

- Q How far is Paoting from Peiping?
- A I do not know definitely.
- Q Would you say about one hundred miles?
- A I believe it might be a little more than a hundred miles.

Q On page 14 of your affidavit you state that the decision to capture Nanking was the result of the tendency of the tide of war on the spot and that the decision was made to capture Nanking on December 1.

Just a moment, I haven't finished my question. You stated a few moments ago that a man by the name of KIYOSHI was Vice-Chief of the General Staff. Weren't you wrong about that?

THE MONITOR: Will you spell out the name,

2

6

5

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

please?

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

MR. TAVENNER: I understood it to be KIYOSHI.

A At the time of the outbreak of the incident the Vice Chief of the General Staff was IMAI, Kiyoshi but since that time he has been replaced.

- Q Did General TADA replace him?
- A Yes, that is so.

Q Now, is it not a fact that General TADA,

Vice Chief of the General Staff, prepared the plans
for the capture of Nanking and that he prepared them
during the battle of Shanghai?

A I am not so familiar with the preparations being made within the General Staff but the decision to capture Nanking was as I have stated in my affidavit the first of December.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Merse & Kapleau

2

3

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q You have also stated that the decision to carry out the Hankow operation was made in Sentember 1938. As a matter of fact, were not the plans for this operation drawn up by General TADA in June or July, 1938?

THE PRESIDENT: 1938?

MR. TAVENNER: Yes, sir.

A I do not know when the plans were first begun but I do know that the decision was made about the first part of September 1938.

MR. TAVENNER: I refer to page 3377 of the record as the basis for my question.

THE PRESIDENT: Did TADA say that in crossexamination?

MR. TAVENNER: Yes, sir, his examination in chief, exhibit 251. This concludes my cross-examination.

THE PRISIDENT: Captain Brooks.

MR. PROOKS: Mr. President, I have got a few questions I would like to ask as to the War Ministry if there is no other general redirect.

MR. LIVIN: There is no other general redirect, Mr. President:

THE PRESIDENT: On whose behalf, Captain Brooks?

MR. BROOKS: On whose behalf? General

MINAMI's, sir.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BROOKS:

You testified the War Ministry was consulted as to supply of materials, personnel and in relation to other administrative matters. Now, Mr. Witness, after a defense plan was set up could the plan of operations be changed and the materials or supplies be used for a different purpose in any manner the General Staff saw fit to use them, for instance, to settle an incident, without approval of the War Minister?

MR. TAVENNER: Your Honor, I object on the grounds that the question is leading, that it is an attempt to ask a hypothetical question which could not possibly cover the facts and that would be improper in an examination of this type.

THE PRESIDENT: If you can fix the War Ministry with a certain responsibility you can re-

MR. BROOKS: I asked the question I did in the interest of saving tire, your Honor, because I think it is fairly clear outside of this qitness' statement made on cross-examination. May be answer the question?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you should be at liberty

2

8

7

10

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

21

22

23

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BROOKS:

You testified the War Ministry was consulted as to supply of materials, personnel and in relation to other administrative matters. Now, Mr. Witness, after a defense plan was set up could the plan of operations be changed and the materials or supplies be used for a different purpose in any manner the General Staff saw fit to use them, for instance, to settle an incident, without approval of the War Minister?

MR. TAVENNER: Your Honor, I object on the grounds that the question is leading, that it is an attempt to ask a hypothetical question which could not possibly cover the facts and that would be improper in an examination of this type.

THE PRESIDENT: If you can fix the War Ministry with a certain responsibility you can re-examine about that.

MR. BROOKS: I asked the question I did in the interest of saving time, your Honor, because I think it is fairly clear outside of this qitness' statement made on cross-examination. May be answer the question?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you should be at liberty

REDIRECT

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

2 BY MR. BROOKS:

Q You testified the War Ministry was consulted as to supply of materials, personnel and relations to other administrative matters. Now, Mr. Witness, 6 after a defense plan was set up could the plan of operations be changed and the materials or supplies be used for a different purpose in any manner the General Staff saw fit to use them, for instance, to settle an incident, without approval of the War Minister?

MR. TAVEHNER: Your Honor, I object on the grounds that the question is leading, that it is an attempt to ask a hypothetical question which could not possibly cover the facts and that would be improper in an examination of this type.

THE PRESIDENT: If you can fix the War Ministry with a certain responsibility you can reexamine about that.

MR. BROOKS: I asked the question I did in the interest of saving time, your Honor, because I think it is fairly clear outside of this witness' statement made on cross-examination. May he answer the question?

THE PRESIDENT: Vell, you should be at liberty

18

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21 22

23

24

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

2 BY MR. BROOKS:

You testified the War Ministry was consulted 4 as to supply of materials, personnel and relations to other administrative matters. Now, Mr. "itness, after a defense plan was set up could the plan of operations be changed and the materials or supplies be used for a different purpose in any manner the General Staff saw fit to use them, for instance, to settle an incident, without approval of the War Minister?

MR. TAVENNER: Your Honor, I object on the grounds that the question is leading, that it is an attempt to ask a hypothetical question which could not possibly cover the facts and that would be improper in an examination of this type.

THE PRESIDENT: If you can fix the War Ministry with a certain responsibility you can reexamine about that.

MR. BROOKS: I asked the question I did in the interest of saving time, your Honor, because I think it is fairly clear outside of this witness' statement made on cross-examination. May he answer the question?

THE PRESIDENT: Vell, you should be at liberty

20

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23 24

to ask him what responsibility the War Ministry would have. He has already fixed them with responsibility for certain action. Answer the question.

A I did not understand the question very will.

I would like to have it repeated once more.

Q "ill the Japanese reporter repeat it, please?

("hereupon, the previous question
was read by the Japanese court reporter.)

A Do you mean operational plans or defense plans?

Q Lither operational plans or defense plans.

Could they be changed without approval of the War Ministry? Once the materials had been supplied and agreed upon was the use of those materials and the operations conducted thereunder solely in the hands of the General Staff?

I shall reply to that question. The materials provided in accordance with operational plans are not supplied to the General Staff. The materials are in the hands of the War Ministry which delivers any such of those materials to the various units directly. Therefore, the General Staff, once it has made -- wishes to change operational plans, for instance -- for example from one directed eastward to one towards the west, it would naturally have to consult the var

.

Ministry, and the reason is that these materials must be transported from the place where they are produced, they must be transported to various units and this question, function of transportation rests with the War Ministry.

Q You are missing the point of my question.

I am not asking --

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know that he is.

It would be unusual really if the War Ministry were asked to authorize expenditure or the use of materials for one purpose and the General Staff could apply them to another.

MR. BROOKS: The point that I am making is not the transporting of materials from one field to another, one unit to another, but after the materials are delivered to the unit in the field could they be used.

THE PRESIDENT: No doubt they could consistently with the purpose for which they were obtained.

Q Could they be used for settling, we will say, an incident by that unit in the field without approval of the War Ministry?

MR. TAVENNER: I don't think this is a proper type of redirect examination. The questions are grossly leading; they are hypothetical; they call for

3 4

6

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

21

22

23

24

opinions and conclusions. It seems to me that the question should not be allowed.

THE PRESIDENT: The real objection is that the question is designed to secure a denial of what the witness has said and not a mere explanation. He has said the War Minister had to approve. Now he is asked to say that he need not approve.

MR. BROOKS: The approval, your Honor, as I got it it was as to supply, not to object, and that is what I was trying to bring out, about the object of the plan.

. 9

2

3

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: The "ar Minister had to know what the purpose of the supply was, and his approval would be limited to that purpose. That is clear enough from the cross-examination in relation to that particular subject matter to which you are confined.

The objection is allowed.

MR. BROOKS: I will try to reach with a different question the point I have in mind.
BY MR. BROOKS:

- O Did the War Minister have authority to give orders stopping or changing military operations in the field?
 - A He had no authority to make such orders.
- O If the army in the field had materials on hand for certain operations, then the "ar Finister could not limit or direct their use, is that correct?
 - A Fe can limit the use of materials.
 - ∩ To what extent?
- A I don't believe that there are any stipulations or regulations regarding the extent of such limitation.
- Now, if an Imperial sanction for such operation was given, could the War Minister withhold the

further supply

further supply if it was requested?

A Once an order for operations has been given and begun -- and the operation has begun, the "ar Minister must do all he can -- must authorize the use of such material in order to attain the object of the operations. When an operational order for operations is given the Chief of Staff, it is customary that the Chief of Staff consult the "ar Minister, and the "ar Minister, taking into consideration various factors, especially from the standpoint of materials, either gives his approval or not at the time he is consulted.

But he cannot give his disapproval or cannot limit the supply to an extent to change the objective if it has Imperial sanction, can he?

MR. TAVENNER: I would like to renew my objection, your Honor, to this same question.

THE PRESIDENT: The answer has been put into the witness' mouth by Mr. Brooks. It is not re-examination in the true sense.

The objection is upheld.

MR. BROOKS: I thought the witness had answered in that line on the previous one before that, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: He hasn't given you a

single answer that you suggested to him.

MR. BROOKS: No further examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. BANNO.

MR. BANNO: I represent the accused

ITAGAKI. I will just ask one question.

THE PRESIDENT: We were told there would be no further redirect, but go ahead and ask him the question.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. BANNO:

According to the question put by the prosecutor, the witness replied on the Hankow operation that although he didn't know when the plans for the Hankow operations were begun, he did know that the decision to do so was made on the first part of September, 1938.

In the preparation of operational plans does the "ar Ministry have anything to do with it?

A Yes, it does have connections.

THE PRESIDENT: It is about time you stopped examining him on these matters. He has made the position perfectly clear in cross-examination and again in redirect examination. You are trying to get him to contradict himself.

O Then, the fact that it was settled -- what

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

was this settlement based upon?

THE MONITOR: Then, how do you know that the plans for the operations were made?

A A decision, that is, a definite decision is made at the time when the Chief of Staff and the War Minister have agreed and are seeking to obtain Imperial sanction.

o Then, when the Imperial sanction has been granted it is most clear, is that what you mean?

A Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Levin.

MR. LEVIN: Mr. President, the witness indicated that the date given on page 22 of his affidavit, August 10, 1930 and 1932, was incorrect and that the date is August 10, 1937. That appears on page 2698 of the record of his testimony. May we ask that that record be corrected in conformity with the statement he has made?

THE PRESIDENT: "e will look into the matter and make any necessary corrections.

MR. LEVIN: With that we have concluded with this witness. May he be released on the usual terms?

THE PRESIDENT: He is at liberty according-

24

```
ly.
                   (Whereupon, the witness was excused.)
             "e will adjourn until half-past one.
                   ("hereupon, at 1200, a recess was
        taken.)
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Barton & Greenberg

3

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Levin.

MR. LEVIN: Mr. President, we now call the witness KAWABE, Torashiro.

TORASHIRO KAWABE, recalled as a witness on behalf of the defense, having previously been sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

THE PRESIDENT: You are still on oath.

MR. LEVIN: Mr. President, I don't believe your remark was translated.

THE PRESIDENT: I told the witness he is.

still on oath. He has already taken an oath in these
proceedings, and there is no occasion for him to take
another. In fact, it would be improper for him to do
so.

Mr. LEVIN: We desire to examine this witness on the basis of two affidavits which have been prepared.

1	
1	DIRECT EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. LEVIN:
3	Q Will you please state your name, age and
4	address?
5	A My name is KAWABE, Torashiro. My age is
6	fifty-seven. My address is No. 460 Azaomachi, Jindai
7	muca, Kitatama-gun, Tokyo City.
8	Q The Marshal will hand you defense document
9	No. 225. Will you please state whether your signa-
10	ture appears thereon?
11	(Whereupon, a document was handed
12	to the witness.)
13	A Yes, that is my signature.
14	Q Are the contents of said document true and
15	correct?
16	A Yes, it is the truth.
17	MR. LEVIN: I now offer in evidence defense
18	document No. 225.
19	THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.
21	CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 225
22	will receive exhibit No. 2489.
23	(Whereupon, the document above re-
24	ferred to was marked defense exhibit No.
25	2489 and received in evidence.)

MR. LEVIN: Omitting formal parts, I shall

25

1	DIRECT EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. LEVIN:
3	Q Will you please state your name, age and
4	address?
5	A My name is KAWABE, Torashiro. My age is
6	fifty-seven. My address is No. 460 Azaomachi, Jindai.
7	muca, Kitatama-gun, Tokyo City.
8	Q The Marshal will hand you defense document
9	No. 225. Will you please state whether your signa-
10	ture appears thereon?
11	(Whereupon, a document was handed
12	to the witness.)
13	A Yes, that is my signature.
14	Q Are the contents of said document true and
15	correct?
16	A Yes, it is the truth.
17	MR. LEVIN: I now offer in evidence defense
18	document No. 225.
19	THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.
20	CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 225
21	will receive exhibit No. 2489.
22	
23	(Whereupon, the document above re-
24	ferred to was marked defense exhibit No.
25	2489 and received in evidence.)

BR. LEVIN: Omitting formal parts, I shall

read the affidavit of the witness. (Reading)

"As I, KAWABE, Torashiro, was a staff officer of the Kwantung Army from August 1934 to March 1936, I shall state what I know about the position of the Kwantung Army in regard to various problems which arose in North China and Inner Mongolia resultant from the then prevailing conditions of Manchuria.

"1. General Condition of the Kwantung Army and Manchuria at the time.

"As the problems of North China and Inner Mongolia, of which I shall speak later on, are related to the condition of the Kwantung Army and Manchuria at the time, I shall first summarize the conditions which prevailed during my term of office.

"Leading officers of the Kwantung Army and the business in my charge.

"In August 1934, when I arrived at my post,
Commander of the Kwantung Army was General HISHIKARI,
Takashi; Chief of Staff, Lieutenant-General NISHIO,
Toshizo; and Vice-Chief of Staff, Major-General
OKAMURA, Yasuji. But in December the same year
General MINAMI, Jiro was appointed Commander and
Major-General ITAGAKI, Seishiro became Vice-Chief of
Staff.

"For a year after taking up my post (when I

à

was Colonel until I left the office was a sectional chief in charge of information.

"Condition of Manchoukuo.

"A. Foreign relations.

"At that time there were some foreign countries which gave official, or at least de facto, recognition of Manchoukuo as an independent state. For instance, the Vatican recognized her in September 1934, and the Dominican Republic in April 1935, while the transfer of the North Manchurian Railway was signed between the Soviet Union and Manchoukuo in March 1935.

"As for the relations with China, the Tangku Truce Pact had been concluded between the Kwantung Army and the military regime in North China in May 1933, the year preceding my arrival at my post, and all-round diplomatic relations had not yet been established between China and Manchoukuo. However, at the so-called Dairen Conference held in July 1933 a mutual agreement was reached as to the means to avoid a Sino-Japanese clash in North China, and since then agreements were concluded in succession between China and Manchoukuo, e.g., in regard to railways in July 1934, concerning customs tariff in December of the same year and regarding mail in February 1935,

mean deliberately destroyed; I mean destroyed or seized by SCAP. It seems to me, Mr. President, however, that this matter should be reached, not on the direct examination but by cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Written agreements are proved by producing them or by oral testimony if their absence is suitably accounted for. The Supreme Commander would not destroy these agreements if he has them or had them.

MR. LEVIN: I did not intend even to intimate that they might have been destroyed by the Supreme Commander. However, Mr. President, in the absence of those agreements, and in the absence of having them in our possession, if the witness is familiar with the contents of them, then he could testify in relation thereto, if we haven't possession of it.

THE PRESIDENT: We are not bound by the rule which requires the agreement to be proved by its production. Nevertheless, it is a rule we will insist on, I think, judging from the attitude of my colleagues.

MR. COMYNS CARR: The Tribunal has, over and over again, called attention to this rule when we have taken the objection and insisted that they should either be produced or accounted for which means, in my submission, by evidence, not by statement of

counsel.

THE PRESIDENT: Unless the agreements are proved in the usual way, we will disregard anything in this affidavit based on them.

MR. LEVIN: (Continued).

"After the declaration of independence of
Manchoukuo in March 1932, the pseudo-troop bandits
who numbered nearly 300,000 under the command of
former war-lords in various provinces were for a time
rampant throughout her territory, but they were for
the most part suppressed in the course of 1933.

Just as in many parts of China, Manchuria was infested by bandits before the founding of manchoukuo
and even after the suppression the remnants were still
active in some localities. Their number was estimated
at about 30,00 at the time when I arrived at my post.
Those bandits may be classified into several groups,
e.g., gangs of regular robbers, those of a political
na*ure resisting Japanese and new Manchurian power, and
bandits imbued with community ideas."

THE PRESIDENT: Communistic.

MR. LEVIN: Communistic.

THE PRESIDENT: Only half of the word appears on the copy but I think it is "communistic".

MR. LEVIN: That is correct, Mr. President.

"Moreover, not all of those bandits were natives of Manchuria. There were many who made their way from North China, Shantung Province of Korea, while some Koreans and Manchurians living in the districts

.

13

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16 17

18

19

21

22

23

of the Russian Littor Province adjacent to Manchoukuo stole in across the border. Among the above classified bandits those who were imbued with some ideology, especially those who had their bases of activity outside Manchuria were most difficult to deal with.

"The peace and order of new Manchuria was considerablely disturbed by those bandits and its healthy growth as a state was much hampered. But as a result of the strenuous efforts on the part of the Manchoukuo Government and people and the assistance extended by the Kwantung Army in accord with the principle of joint defense as stipulated in the Protocol between Japan and Manchoukuo, the independence of Manchoukuo gradually took definite shape, particularly as her relations with China and other countries were more and more improved. On the frontiers, however, troubles still occurred frequently.

"General policy of the Kwantung Army at the time.

"Under the principles set forth in the Protocal it was the duty of the Kwantung Army to undertake the defense of Manchuria in cooperation with the Manchoukuo Government. In view of the existing condition of the country, the Kwantung Army, especially after the commander, General MINAMI's arrival at his post,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

adopted as the two main objects of its policy, (1) establishment of public order in the interior of Manchoukuo and (2) maintenance of peace and quiet in the border regions. In order to accomplish the first objedt, the entire strength of the Army was dispersed widely over the country so as to contribute to the maintenance of local peace and order, even at the disadvantage and inconvenience that might be caused thereby to the training in proficiency essential to an army. For the second object the Army made it its principle to avoid the use of armed force as much as possible and to ensure the enjoyment of mutal benefit through prudent measures taken by neighboring countries among themselves, through parleys and negotiations held by the Manchoukuo Government or the Kwantung Army at its discretion with China, the Soviet Union, Outer Mangolia and others.

"DOHIHARA-Chin Te-chun Agreement.

"It was in the regions on the border between Manchuria and Chahar Province, China, that the troubles referred to above occurred most frequently. Among them may be mentioned the insult to the Japanese military officers and Foreign Office clerks at Changpei by Sung Che-yuan troops on October 6, 1934, intrusion into Manchoukuo of a unit of Sung Che-yuan trops on January

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24, 1935, second intrusion and firing of a Sung Cheyuan unit upon the Japanese border garrison. Fearing that such frequent troubles on the borders might lead to more untoward affairs between China and Manchoukuo or Japan, the Commander of the Kwantung Army deemed it proper to enlarge the scope of application of the Tangku Truce Agreement, and under instructions from the highest military authorities at home despatched Major General DOHIHARA, Kenji, who was on the staff of the Kwantung Army and Chief of the Special Service Agency in Mukden, to carry on negotiations with the Chahar Province authorities in China. The reason why Major-General DOHIHARA was entrusted with this mission was (1) because those trouble had arisen within the area for which he was in charge of information and DOHIHARA was well versed in the actual facts of the affairs, and (2) because his character was bast suited for negotiating with the Chinese on those sundry affairs and settling them in a friendly, peaceful way.

"As a result of his negotiations the DOHIHARA-Chin Te-chun Agreement was signed on June 27, 1935.

It stipulates the dealing with the responsible persons and the units concerned, the suppression of anti-Japanese agitations in Chahar Province, the area where cessation of hostilities was to be effected, etc. By

23

24

83 ×

this agreement the Chinese demilitarized zone was extended to part of Chahar Province, and peace and order could be anticipated in this part of the border."

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, we have the same objection to this. The agreement is not produced nor accounted for nor admitted.

THE PRESIDENT: Our decision covers this also. MR. LEVIN: (Continued).

"A few days after the conclusion of the agreement, when Major-General DOHIHARA came to the Kwantung Army Headquarters to make a verbal report on the negotiations to the Commander, I was in attendance and could listen to it. From his report and also from what was told by a member of the staff who accompanied the Major-General, I gathered that the negotiations had been carried on in a very friendly manner.

"III. The Kwantung Army's concern about Inner Mongolia.

"A considerable part of the western borders of Manchoukuo abuts on Inner Mongolia, while in Hsingan Province and the Jehol area in Manchoukuo there lived many Mongolians who constantly intercommunicated with similar tribes in Inner Mongolia. To the Kwantung Army which was responsible for the defense of Man-

30 4

6

8

10

11

9

12

15 16

14

17

19

21

23

25

this agreement the Chinese demilitarized *one was extended to part of Chahar Province, and peace and order could be anticipated in this part of the border."

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, we have the same objection to this. The agreement is not produced nor accounted for nor admitted.

THE PRESIDENT: Our decision covers this also.
MR. LEVIN: (Continued).

"A few days after the conclusion of the agreement, when Major-General DOHIHARA came to the Kwantung Army Headquarters to make a verbal report on the negotiations to the Commander, I was in attendance and could listen to it. From his report and also from what was told by a member of the staff who accompanied the Major-General, I gathered that the negotiations had been carried on in a very friendly manner.

"III. The Kwantung Army's concern about Inner Mongolia.

"A considerable part of the western borders of Manchoukuo abuts on Inner Mongolia, while in Hsingan Province and the Jehol area in Manchoukuo there lived many Mongolians who constantly intercommunicated with similar tribes in Inner Mongolia. To the Kwantung Army which was responsible for the defense of Man-

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

churia, therefore, it was a matter of grave concern as well as an important focus of attention in collecting information about the condition of Inner Mongolia, how it would affect Manchuria, and in particular whether Red influence would be exerted on Manchuria. The Mongolians in Inner Mongolia who had harbored . antipathy egainst the Chinese, were given impetus from the independence of Manchoukuo and were striving to establish a self-governing machinery of their own with Prince Te, an influential figure among them, as the leading spirit. The Kwantung Army was aware that Prince Te made it an important aim in his policy to prevent Inner Mongolia from turning Red. While I was at my post in the Kwantung Army the relations between Manchuria and Inner Mongolia were amicable with no trouble arising between them. In December 1935 a skirmish occurred near lanchoukuo borders between a unit under Prince Te's command and Chinese troops. We feared lest it should lead to some trouble in Manchoukuo, but it was settled in a short space of time before it developed into a serious matter.

"IV. The Kwantung Army's concern about the East Hopei Anti-Communist Autonomous Council.

"Under the Tangku Truce Agreement an area of North China adjoining the Manchoukuo borders had been

14

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

tarized zone.

2 3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

designated as a demilitarized zone, where the Kwantung Army held the right of carrying out inspection as occasion demanded.

"And after the conclusion of the said truce pact, Mr. YIN Ju-Keng of China, on the recommendation of Mr. HUANG Fu, Chairman of the North China Political Affairs Adjustment Commission, became administrative inspector for 23 counties in the above-said demili-

"To the Kwantung Army it was naturally a matter of important concern whether the condition of ... the area was consistent with the objects of the truce pact, and whether the demilitarized zone would turn Red. Especially in the Jehol area, which adjoined the area in question, the activity of communist bandits had been incessant from former times, and so the Kwantung Army was making special efforts in collecting information about conditions in East Hopei. Mr. YIN Ju-keng, just referred to above, dissatisfied with the financial policy of the Nanking Government, and in view of the fact that in the district under his control a peasants' agitation for self-government was started at the communists' instigation in October 1935, deemed it necessary to establish his political authority and carry out financial autonomy and anti-

23

4

3

6

5

8

9

10

12 13

14

15

17

19

20

13

21

23

25

communism in the area. At last, in November 1935, he organized the East Hopei Anti-Communist Autonomous Council under his chairmanship and declared the establishent of an autonomous government.

"Position of the Kwantung Army in regard to the Formation of the Hopei-Chahar Political Council."

THE PRESIDENT: You missed a paragraph.

MR. LEVIN. The above paragraph, I understand, is not in the original. That is, the paragraph following the one I just read.

THE PRESIDENT: Our copies are different from yours, apparently, Mr. Levin.

MR. LEVIN: The next paragraph, beginning with "Previous to the declaration", that pagraph is in error, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: That comes out.

MR. LEVIN: I will proceed to read the fifth paragraph on page 9:

"V. Position of the Kwantung Army in regard to the Formation of the Hopei-Chahar Political Council.

"After the conclusion of the Tengku Truce
Agreement there came into existence in North China
a political machinery called the North China Political
Affairs Adjustment Commission, with Mr. HUANG Fu as
Chairman and exercising control over the five provinces

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

of North China. Such Chinase political machinery in North China had since undergone some changes. And with the growing improvement in the relations between Japan and China as well as between China and Manchukuo as mentioned above, especially after the signing of the DOHIHARA-Chin Te-chun Agreement in June 1935, which made wider arrangements for the maintenance of peace and order on the China-Manchoukuo borders, the Kwentung Army beceme aware of the fact that among the war-lords in North China there was an inclination to form a new political structure as a bond between Chins and Manchoukuo and hoped that it might take advantage of the inclination to devise some anti-communistic measures between China and Manchoukuo, promote intimate relations between the two countries, and secure the national defense of Manchoukuo. Deeming it a proper opportunity to despatch some envoy to explain to the war-lords in North China the position of Manchoukuo as well as of the Kwantung Army and quicken the realization of their intentions, the Kwantung Army, with the approval of highest military authorities at home and after consultation with the command of the Japanese expeditionary forces in China, sent Major-General DOHIHARA again to Peiping in November 1935, for he was regarded as best suited for such

negotiations.

"The position of the Kwantung Army with regard to the political machinery in North China and the reasons for the despatch of Major-General DOHIHARA were as stated above. Pending the negotiations the Major-General once returned to the Kwantung Army himself and the staff officer who accompanied him told me at that time, I learnt that during his week's stay in Peiping, Major General DOHIHARA had held friendly talks with war-lords aware of the fact that Sung Che-yuan and others were keeping in close touch with the negotiations in a very friendly and peaceful manner."

Duda & Whalen

2

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Will the Marshal please give the witness defense document No. 971.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

Q Will you please refer to defense document 971 and state whether your signature appears thereon?

A Yes, there is a signature. That is mine.

Q I understand that there are several corrections that you desire to make to this affidavit.

A I should like to make corrections because I believe that in three or four places are errors with regard to date.

Q Will you please state what they are and where they appear. I understand the first one is on page 12 of the English copy.

A I understand on page 11 in the English, under paragraph VI: "Arrangements made by the Central Command in conformity with the change of situation following that of the preceding paragraph."

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, would it not be better to postpone making corrections until it has been admitted? I propose to object to it.

THE PRESIDENT: You are not objecting to the document as it is, but as it is proposed to correct it?

MR. COMYNS CARK: No, your Honor, as a whole.

21 22

23 24

THE PRESIDENT: Well, there can be no harm in telling us what corrections it is proposed to make, because we want the whole document as it is proposed to be tendered before us before we decide on your objections.

Well, what are the corrections?

Q What are the corrections? The same correction on page 14, I understand.

THE INTERPRETER: The witness said paragraph 6, page 8 of the English, "The attitude of the Central Military Supreme Command at the time the Lukucchiao Incident broke out." That paragraph.

A Page 12 of the English, paragraph 2. "Since then, while observing the situation, the Central Command came to know various things from reports from various quarters up to the evening of July 13th."

THE MONITOR: And after that there are subparagraphs 1 and 2, or A and B -- 1 and 2.

A "Facing the situation as mentioned above, the Central Command decided on the policy for dealing with these matters concerning the incident at 8 P.M. on the 13th." That is the last half of the second subparagraph.

Next to that, "(1) Our Army will adhere closely to the policy of non-enlargement of the situation or to

2

1

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

settle locally and to make the utmost effort to avoid such actions that will lead to a full-scale war. Therefore, our Army will approve the conditions for settlement proposed by the representative of the 29th Army and signed at 8 P.M. on the 10th . . . " This "10th" should be "at 8 P.M. of the 11th."

That is the first correction.

At the end of page 13 there is a paragraph (c) and followed by (1) (2) (3) and (4) sub-paragraphs. In this paragraph (4), "Some units of the Chinese Central Army marched into Hopei Province.

"Under these circumstances, considering the possible danger that we might be hampered by this intentional dragging-out policy of the Chinese authorities and miss the chance of mobilization and dispatch of troops, our Central Supreme Command decided upon a settlement measure to the following effect and instructed our garrison in China.

"The Garrison should have Sung Che-yuan affix another signature upon the settlement terms which were signed on July 10th..." This "July 10th" should be "July 11th."

THE PRESIDENT: It is extraordinary that so much time should be wasted on such simple corrections.

A There is one other, page 15 in English; the

middle of page 15 of the English:

"Thus while expecting the situation at the spet to improve. . ." and so forth. Fourth from the last line of the paragraph, "The Twenty-Ninth Army on or after the 29th . . ." That should be the 28th.

The above three corrections are those which had come to my attention after looking over the printed text. The mistake was due to an error on my part, and I apologize for wasting the time of the Court.

Q Is the document, with the corrections as indicated by you, true and correct?

A Yes, it is the truth.

MR. LEVIN: I now offer in evidence the affidavit of KAWABE, Torashiro, defense document No. 971.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, this is a particularly bad example of the disregard of the Tribunal's warning that documents must be produced or accounted for. On almost every page there is a reference either to something which is in terms described as a document or to something which obviously must have been contained in a document. But from beginning to end there is not the slightest attempt to produce or account for one single one of the documents referred to.

The defense has now had ample time to consider and deal with the rulings of the Court on this subject; and in our submission, if they persist in disregarding those rulings the affidavit should be rejected.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Levin.

MR. LEVIN: Mr. President, I believe a substantial portion of the affidavit does not relate to documents, and I am sure that my associates will endeavor to obtain them if they are available. I believe part of the difficulty, of course, arises, Mr. President, because we are now required to offer our proof by affidavit. The prosecution, of course, would not have been in position to make an omnibus objection to the testimony of a witness whose examination is

-23

 being conducted by question and answer.

However, I desire to state that we all desire to adhere and to follow the directions and ruling of the Court; and in so far as a portion of this testimony relates to documents, as I said before, naturally if we are unable to supply them, naturally the Court will have to exclude the evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: The requirement of affidavits has made no difference. Had you given the evidence in the ordinary way you would still have to account for the documents or produce them.

One wonders how much time we are wasting when residing documents which may be disregarded because the particular documents are not produced.

MR. LEVIN: This is a rather lengthy affidavit, and while I have gone over it before and am hurriedly going over it again, I looked at the first ten pages here at least where I don't find, in this hurried examination, any reference to a document. There may be some, however, that I do not either recall or that I do not see at the moment.

I believe, Mr. President, if I began reading the document, the affidavit, and in the meantime would request one of my colleagues to make some examination of it where reference is made to documents, we can omit those, if the Court prefers to have it done in that way.

THE PRESIDENT: The Court has every desire to meet you, but most of us think that you should be made to observe the rule because it is hardly worth-while reading affidavits in part only.

MR. LEVIN: I have been informed by one of my Japanese associates that they have affidavits to the effect that some of these documents have been burned and are not in existence. I can't tell which ones.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, that is exactly what I expected. If it is said that these documents -if proved that these documents are amongst those which we have proved as to a large number to have been destroyed by order of the Japanese Army between the date of the surrender and the actual entry of Allied troops into Japan, that circumstance in itself would throw considerable light upon the authenticity of a witness who is of the Japanese Army, the authenticity of his recollection as to their contents. The question would immediately arise, why, if the documents were of so innocent a character as the witness represents them to be, the Japanese Army should have burned them.

THE PRESIDENT: The Court insists on the

7 8

observance of the rule; the document must be annexed to the affidavit or its absence accounted for in the affidavit, itself. And a majority of the Court wish to apply that rule to this affidavit, which is rejected. So the objection is upheld.

The witness can stand down until a fresh affidavit is obtained.

MR. LEVIN: The prosecution may cross-examine on the evidence that has been accepted.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, with regard to the affidavit which has been read in part, the prosecution does not think it necessary to cross-examine but only to draw the attention of the Tribunal to certain references.

MR. LEVIN: May it please the Tribunal, we object to that form of argument because that is in the nature of an argument and not a cross-examination. It seems to me at some future time they would have an opportunity and a right to draw attention to certain inferences which may be drawn from the affidavit, and not at the present time.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, that is purely a matter of the convenience of the Tribunal and the saving of time. It is quite true that if we wish to present an argument about this matter the proper time

4 5

to do so would be later. All I proposed to do was not to present an argument but to give the Tribunal references to certain passages of the record which, in our submission, should be read in conjunction with this affidavit. I understood that to be in line with what the --

THE PRESIDENT: I am reminded that defense counsel have done this but have done so without objection. The point has not arisen before.

MR. COMYNS CARR: What I was about to say was that I understood that to be in line with -- I would not say exactly covered by, but in line with an intimation that the Tribunal gave yesterday.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, there is no objection at any stage to a mere reference, but when it comes to reading anything it is different.

MR. COMYNS CARR: All right.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, what is your reference?

MR. COMYNS CARR: This witness has given evidence before. His direct testimony was on pages 19,393 to 19,425. He was cross-examined at pages 19,425 to 19,470. The accused MINAMI was cross-examined on the same matters covered by this particular affidavit on pages 19,948 to 20,006, when reference was made to exhibits 195, 240, and 2206.

MG H

12

5

7

9

10

11

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

23 24

KAWABE

THE PRESIDENT: That helps us to get the material without influencing our judgment in any way.

MR. COMYNS CARR: If your Honor please, there is one other exhibit, No. 259, to which reference might well have been made during the cross-examination of MINAMI on these particular matters and is made now.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Levin.

MR. LEVIN: May I ask, under the circumstances, that the witness be released on the usual terms, preserving the right, if we may, to recall him with a corrected affidevit conforming to the rules laid down by the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: He is released on the usual terms.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. LEVIN: I now call the witness, SHIBAYAMA, Kaneshiro -- 1132.

KANESHIRO SHIBAYAMA, called as 1 a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese 3 interpreters as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION 6 BY MR. LEVIN: 7 Q Will you please state your name, age, 8 and address? 9 A My name is SHIBAYAMA, Kaneshiro; I was 10 born on the 11th of May -- the 1st of May, the 11 22nd year of Meiji; my address is 861 Komaba Machi, 12 Meguro Ward, City of Tokyo. 13 Captain Van Meter will hand you defense 14 document 1132. Will you please state whether your 15 signature appears thereon? 16 Yes, my signature appears thereon. 17 Are the contents of said document true and 13 . correct? 19 There is one point, one place where a 20 correction is required. In the first part it says, 21 "from August, 8th year of Showa, that is, 1933."

Yes, it is.

true and correct?

It should be, not August, but May of 1933.

With that correction is the affidavit

22

23

24

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

MR. LEVIN: I now offer in evidence defense document 1132, which is the affidavit of SHIBAYAMA, Kaneshiro.

MR. COMYNS CARR: The same objection as before, your Honor. The only matter of importance in the affidavit is an alleged document said to have been signed in the last line by one. It is not produced, and as far as we are aware it never existed.

MR. LEVIN: Mr. President, the entire affidavit, I think, is fully competent and proper excepting that one statement. There is no reference to any other agreement except the Tangku agreement, which has been referred to many times in the trial. As a matter of fact, itwas my impression that the UMEZU-Ho Ying-chien agreement had also been introduced in evidence. I cannot say for a certainty that that is a fact. However, if that is not a fact, nevertheless it seems to me we should be permitted to offer this affidavit in evidence, because it can readily be separated from that part which might be objectionable; and that brings me to the point that if the witness had been testifying by question and answer and he had given the greater portion of his testimony and had been

21 22 23

24

examined concerning it, and we came to a point 1 2 where a question was asked in relation to a 3 document which had not been offered in evidence an objection could be made and would be sustained, but we would not be prevented from offering the balance of the testimony. I ask permission, Mr. President, at this 8 time to withdraw the last two sentences of this 9 affidit. THE PRESIDENT: You offer in evidence the whole of the affidavit except the last two sentences? 12 MR. LEVIN: That is correct, your Honor. THE PRESIDENT: A colleague suggests the 14 last three sentences. 15 MR. LEVIN: I agree with that, Mr. President. Had I read it carefully I would have also suggested 17

that sentence be omitted. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, we will accept it. Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERY OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 1132 will receive exhibit No. 2490.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2490 and received in evidence.)

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for

7

10

11

13

16

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

Kapleau & Yelden

fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess
was taken until 1500, after which the
proceedings were resumed as follows:)

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Levin.

MR. LEVIN: Mr. President, I do not wish to open a decision rendered by the Tribunal, but I am advised that the word "signed" on the third page of this affidavit is improperly and inaccurately translated. I am informed that was a verbal agreement, and therefore I request that the document be submitted to the Language Section for examination.

THE PRESIDENT: There is nothing to prevent your questioning the witness, in addition to tendering this affidavit, later.

MR. LEVIN: (Reading)

"From August, the 8th year of Showa (1933) to December, the 9th year of Showa (1934), I served in Peking as an assistant of the Military Attache to the Japanese Embassy in China."

THE PRESIDENT: "From August" we have.
MR. LEVIN: That should be "from May"

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

instead of "from August."

"After the Manchurian Incident, the feeling between Japan and China was markedly threatening, but it was temporarily restored to tranquility with the conclusion of the Tangku Agreement, and diplomatic relations between the two states begen to proceed smoothly once again. This was indicated by the Dairen Conference relative to transportation and communication. The object of this Conference was the opening of transportation and communication between Manchukuo and North China. In other words, it was nothing but to have diplomatic relations return to normalcy. The leader of the North China Regime at the time was Huang Fu, who was directly responsible for transportation and communication work. This, however, was so serious a diplomatic problem that they could not successfully deal with it by disregarding the Nanking Government. Therefore, the North China authorities received orders from the Nanking Government and in its behalf carried on negotiation. But the Nanking Government never did directly concern itself in it. That was because it tried to keep away from formally recognizing the independence of Manchukuo. In other words, in those days the Nanking Government, as a

24

matter of actuality, recognized her. I heard of this at the time from many a Chinese leader. The diplomatic relations between the two states was in this manner gradually improved, but the under-currents of anti-Japanese feeling among the Chinese people never disappeared and remained vigorous as ever, correlating with the secret activities of the Communists.

"This was made manifest by the assassination of a pro-Japanese correspondent which took place in Tientsin in May, 1936 (Showa 11). "ithout eliminating such terroristic dark age administration or anti-Japanese current thought, North China could be made bright and peaceful and after all the rapproachment between Japan and China could not be expected."

THE PRESIDENT: That is full of broad generalities, isn't it?

PR. LEVIN: I would like to ask the wit-

THE PRESIDENT: It is interesting to know who the Chinese leaders were and just what they told him.

BY MR. LEVIN:

O Can you tell us who the Chinese leaders

were and what they told you?

A At that time Ying Tung, who was the Chief of the Railway Bureau of the Peining Railway, told me at that time that members of the Nanking Government actually recognized Manchukuo. Correction:

At that time Ying Tung, who was the director of the Railway Bureau of the Peining Railway, told me that the Nanking Government was actually and gradually coming to recognize Manchukuo.

- o Were there any others?
- A I don't remember.
- O Can you tell us what efforts, if any,
 General UNEZU made with reference to the withdrawal
 of anti-Japanese forces from North China?

A At that time in North China there were various -- it was rumored that various terroristic activities were taking place, that the Blue Shirt -- members of the Blue Shirt Society from Nanking, the members of the Fourth Corps -- the Fourth Battalian of the Gendarmerie and terroristic elements of the Chinese Central Army should be cleared from North China in order to clarify and to make more peaceful the conditions in North China. I believe that was what UNEZU felt at that time.

And was he able to make any such arrange-

-

ment?

A At that time he talked to the Chinese authorities and asked that such elements be removed from North China -- or he falt that only by removing -- there was no other way except by removing these elements from North China.

THE MONITOR: There was no other way but to ask of the Chinese authorities to remove those elements from North China.

O Did he make any such arrangement with the Chinese authorities?

A Yes, that was later embodied in what is referred to generally as the UMEZU-Ho Ying-chien agreement.

THE MONITOR: I understand that is a verbal agreement.

MR. LEVIN: That is all, Mr. President.
You may cross-examine.

I am advised now, Mr. President, that the word "signed" should be "made." Mr. Brooks informs me that the Language Section informed him to that effect, but in view of the fact that the evidence has been given orally, it would be unnecessary to read that portion of the affidavit.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Sutton.

24

25

	CROSS-EXAMINATION.
BY MR. SI	UTTON:
0	When did you leave North China?
A	In December of 1934.
o,	There were you at the time the so-called
Ho-UMEZU	agreement was made?
A	I was the commander of the 18th Regiment
in Kurum	e at that time.
٥	And from whom did you receive your infor-
mation r	elative to it?
A	I heard directly from General UMEZU at
a later	date.
	PR. SUTTON: I desire to call the Tribunel's
attentio	n to the fact that the evidence introduced
on behal	f of the prosecution with regard to this
agreemen	t is the testimony of John Goette, record
page 374	6 to 3749, the League of Nations Report,
Exhibit	58, st page 300 in exhibit 2206-A.
	There is no further cross-examination.
	MR. LEVIN: I submit, Mr. President, that
that is	not cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: No, it is not, but he did

MR. LFVIN: I ask that the witness be ex-

cross-examine. I think he meant that.

cused on the usual terms.

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly. (Thereupon, the witness was excused.) MR. LEVIN: We now call the witness 3 ISHIKA"A. Jun. 5 JUN ISHIKA "A, called as a witness on 6 behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows: 10 DIRECT EXAMINATION 11 BY !R. LEVIN: o Till you please state your name, age, and 12 13 address? 14 A My name is ISHIKAWA, Jun, my age is forty-15 six, and my address is No. 542 Narita-Machi, Imba-16 Gun, Chiba Prefecture. 17 O Captain Van Neter will hand you defense 18 document No. 972. "ill you please state whether 19 your signature appears thereon? 20 A (Examining) Yes, there is my signature. 21 o are the contents of said document true and 22 correct?

A There is no mistake.

25

THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly. 2 (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) 3 MR. LEVIN: We now call the witness ISHIKA"A, Jun. 5 6 JUN ISHIKA "A, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows: 10 DIRECT EXAMINATION 11 BY MR. LEVIN: 12 o Will you please state your name, age, and 13 address? 14 A 'y name is ISHIKA"A, Jun, my age is forty-15 six, and my address is No. 542 Marita-Machi, Imba-16 Gun, Chiba Prefecture. 17 Captain Van Neter will hand you defense 18 document No. 972. "ill you please state whether 19 your signature appears thereon? 20 A (Examining) Yes, there is my signature. 21 C are the contents of said document true and 22 correct? 23 A There is no mistake.

MR. LEVIN: I now offer in evidence defense document No. 972, same being the affidavit of ISHIKAWA, Jun.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No.

972 will receive exhibit No. 2491.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2491 and received in evidence.)

MR. LEVIN: I now read the affidavit of ISHIKAWA, Jun:

"Q Please state the period of your residence in North China and your duties while there.

"A I was in residence in North China between September 1932 and January 1937 as head of the Mainichi Shimbun Peiping Branch and in addition head of the Tentsing Branch of the same paper.

"Q Please state the political situation in North China at that time.

"A My period of residence was from the Manchurian Incident to the spring of the year in which the China Incident broke out, so North China was the cynosure of the world, being in an atmosphere delicate as well as most serious, from a military, political, and economic point of view. As a result of the agreement,

3

5

4

6

7

9

10

11

13

14

16

17

18

20

21

22 23

24

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

signed at Tangku May 31, 1933, of the suspension of hostilities, the Chitung area saw the creation of a demilitarized zone in it. In regard to the preservation of public peace, the Kwantung Army had a voice. Chang Hsueh-liang had left Peiping and the former northeast army had lost its power in North China; the Executive Council Administration Adjustment Committee stationed in Peiping whose chairman was Huang Fu, and in addition the Peiping subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee had been sent with Ho Ying-chien, the Chief of the Military Administration Department as its chairman pro tempore.

"Q Was North China then in friendly relations with Japan?

"A Not necessarily so. Because of close geographical and economic relations between North China and Manchoukuo, as a natural course of event, political frictions were likely to arise in the former, and because of a strong desire for restoring the lost territory, somehow or other we felt there was unrest though not yet coming to the surface.

"Q When did Major-General UMEZU arrive as Commander of the Garrison in China?

"A In April, 1934.

"Q How was the attitude of the common people to

22 23

24

Major-General UMEZU's arrival as such? "A Because of the Major-General's reputation as a man of good common sense with moderate and fair 4 thoughts, his coming was generally welcomed. With 5 this general as Commander, they thought that he would 6 hot make a mistake in coping with the complicated 7 state of affairs in North China. "O How were you related with Major-General UMEZU? "A While there, I had come to be on very intimate 10 terms with him. Not as a newspaper man, but rather as 11 a member of the Japanese nation, I often had interviews 12 and frankly expressed my opinion and occasionally re-13 minded him of the behavior of the Army. The Commander 14 frankly admitted my unreserved opinion and gladly ex-15 pressed his own thoughts on the matter. "Q Why did you come to be on intimate terms 17 with Major-General UMEZU? Was there any motive? "A The Commander once expressed his thoughts as 19 follows: 'Since the Manchurian Incident Japan's 20 foreign relations have become tense. So Japan's atti-21 tude toward North China has been the cynosure of the 22 world, we should use prudence and caution in our behavior. 23 I may be here one year or two years. I don't know how 24 long. I would rather prefer being called a fool during 25 my stay than having trouble with China. I want you to

understand this and I wish you too will be a fool in the same sense as I am.!

"I was very deeply impressed with this brief remark of immense significance. Believing there

would arise no trouble in North China while this
Commander was in office, I positively wished to be
good friends with the Commander without reserve, and
I did so. Besides, the fairness of his thoughts regarding our attitude toward China also proved a motive

of my being attracted to him.
"Q How did the Commander express to you his

thoughts regarding our attitude toward China?

"A The Commander often told me the following in substance as follows:

"(A) It is not proper for Japan to behave toward China with a sense of superiority.

"(B) We should take a sound and fair attitude toward China. Threats and coersion should never be resorted to on any account.

"(C) The rights and interests of Powers in North China should be fully respected. I strictly prohibit any act tending to infringe on these.

"(D) We should never interfere in Chinese internal affairs.

"Q The UMEZU-Ho Ying-chien agreement is said to

2

1

5

7

9

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

19 20

21

22

24

have been proposed by Japan on the assassination of pro-Japanese newspaper men. Please tell us what you know about this matter.

"A In spring, 1935, the anti-Japanese sentiment in North China was quite serious, giving rise to even sanguinary incidents. Thus the situation had been increasingly threatening. In the meantime, on May 5 Hu En-pu, proprietor of the Kuo Chuan Pao was assassinated in the Japanese concession in Tientsin, and the next day on the 3d, Pai E yu-huan, proprietor of the Chen Pao, met the same fate in the Japanese concession. These two persons had been regarded as pro-Japanese. The observation, on the part of the Japanese garrison, on this matter was that the Kuomintung party was behind the assassins and everything related with these incidents.

"On May 29 when I heard that the Chief of
the Staff Colonel SAKAI, Takashi and a military
officer posted in Peiping called on General Ho Ying-chien
and submitted various demands to him, I wished to ask
the Commander's opinion, but since he was out in
Shinking being wired for by the War Minister HAYASHI,
I saw him when he came back from the trip. Then the
Commander told me as follows:

"'Frequent assassinations are really injurious

1.1

to the diplomatic relations. If China fail to take some drastic measures toward this matter, unfortunate incidents will repeatedly happen. The agreement regarding the North China incident also provides for the suppression of anti-foreign acts. I sent the chief of the staff with items desired by us to talk with representatives of the Chinese Government as to how can we brighten, in the spirit of the agreement, the situation in North China. The items suggested by us were briefly this: The military forces and political party local chapters, from which dark politics or terrorism are likely to originate, should just be removed from the districts where Japanese residents are. I learned from him that it was not anything formal like a treaty or an agreement but simply an oral representation, and felt relieved as I thought such a step was just what his character might dictate. !

"Q Was this representation accepted by the Chinese?

"A General Ho Ying-chien, as a result of his previous conference with the Nanking Government, accepted the items proposed by the Japanese Army and on June 10 withdrew of his own accord the anti-Japanese military forces. So there is nothing like an agreement. There is much misunderstanding about this and many people think as if there is an agreement because the

2

4

6

7 8

9

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

 newspapers designated it the UNEZU-Ho Ying-chien agreement.

"Q Was Commander aware at that time that this representation had provoked the Chinese Government?

"A It is true that it proved more provocative than expected on account of poor statemanship on the part of the negotiators themselves. Commander UMEZU tried not to give any further provocation to the Chinese.

"I will give you one example:

"In the middle of June I had a visit from Hsu Hsiu-chih, Vice-Minister of the Department of Internal Affairs, from whom I got the following representation: 'Kwantung Army airplanes are found flying over the withdrawing central military forces. There is danger of occasioning a war. Will you tell this to Commander UMEZU and ask him to stop it?' Immediately I called on the Commander and told him all about this. The Commander readily wired to the Kwantung Army and had it stopped, which favorably influenced the Chinese Government. This I learned later from Hsu Hsin-chih

Wolf & Morse

"Q Didn't he secretly expect the birth of somethink like a North China government or a self-government movement as a result of this agreement?

"A The Farmers' Self-government Movement was organized two months after Mr. UMFZU's departure and the Chicha Government four months after. It is not thinkable that he secretly expected the birth of such organizations behind the agreement. Mr. UMFZU, being of such a character, did not like politics and had a firm conviction that we should never interfere with the internal affairs of China. Though I had often talked with the Commander about China, I could hear from him not a word about such intension. So far as I am concerned, I shall never hesitate to deny it.

"Q Wesn't there any gulf or difference between the Army Commander and the Chief of the Staff in regard to their opinion or character?

"A There was a considerable difference, it seems to me. I heard the Chief of the Staff publicly say 'The Army Commander is weak.' I often heard the Chief of the staff criticising the Commander because he was dissatisfied with the Commander who thoroughly rejected military oppression or coersion policies. Then the Chief of the Staff SAKAI was going to make a representation to Ho Ying-chim, he suggested to the Commander

DIRECT

the concentration of our garrison forces in Peking,
but the Commander did not permit it, saying it was not
proper to make a demand by force of arms. I remember
the Chief of the Staff criticized the Commander thus
under these circumstances. I learned from the Commander
himself at that time regarding the concentration of
our military forces."

You may cross-examine the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: Surely no American counsel had a hand in drafting that.

WR. SUTTON: May it please the Tribunal, there will be no cross-examination of this witness.

MR. LEVIN: May the witness be excused on the usual terms?

THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. LEVIN: We now offer in evidence defense documents Nos. 1157, 1158 and 1159, which are certificates relating to telegrams dispatched in connection with the settlement of the North China Incident.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOIAN: Might I be permitted to inquire if this is an effort to comply with the best evidence rule in respect to missing documents?

22

8

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

DIRECT

the concentration of our garrison forces in Peking,
but the Commander did not permit it, saying it was not
proper to make a demand by force of arms. I remember
the Chief of the Staff criticized the Commander thus
under these circumstances. I learned from the Commander
himself at that time regarding the concentration of
our military forces."

You may cross-examine the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: Surely no American counsel had a hand in drafting that.

MR. SUTTON: May it please the Tribunal, there will be no cross-examination of this witness.

MR. LEVIN: May the witness be excused on the usual terms?

THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. LEVIN: We now offer in evidence defense documents Nos. 1157, 1158 and 1159, which are certificates relating to telegrams dispatched in connection with the settlement of the North China Incident.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOIAN: Might I be permitted to inquire if this is an effort to comply with the best evidence rule in respect to missing documents?

24

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

the concentration of our garrison forces in Peking,
but the Commander did not permit it, saying it was not
proper to make a demand by force of arms. I remember
the Chief of the Staff criticized the Commander thus
under these circumstances. I learned from the Commander
himself at that time regarding the concentration of
our military forces."

You may cross-examine the witness.

IR. SUTTON: May 1 please the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Sutton.

MR. SUTTON: There will be no cross-exemination of this witness

MR. LEVIN: May the witness be excused on the usual terms?

THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly.
(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. LEVIN: "e now offer in evidence defense documents Nos. 1157, 1158 and 1159 which are certificates relating to telegrams dispatched in connection with the settlement of the North China Incident.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: Might I be permitted to inquire if this is an effort to comply with the best evidence rule in respect to missing documents?

21

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

25

the concentration of our garrison forces in Peking,
but the Commander did not permit it, saying it was not
proper to make a demand by force of arms. I remember
the Chief of the Staff criticized the commander thus
under these circumstances. I learned from the Commander
himself at that time regarding the concentration of
our military forces."

You may cross-examine the witness.

iR. SUTTON: May it please the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Sutton.

MR. SUTTON: There will be no cross-exemination of this witness

MR. LEVIN: May the witness be excused on the usual terms?

THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly.
(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. LEVIN: We now offer in evidence defense documents Nos. 1157, 1158 and 1159 which are certificates relating to telegrams dispatched in connection with the settlement of the North China Incident.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: Might I be permitted to inquire if this is an effort to comply with the best evidence rule in respect to missing documents?

25

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. LEVIN: This relates to --

THE PRESIDENT: "e don't know what the documents are, Brigadier.

(Thereupon, documents were distributed to the Bench.)

THE PRESIDENT: Now we will know what you are talking about, Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: Your Honor, I do not appreciate the purpose for which these documents are being offered and I thought perhaps my learned friend would assist me in my dilemma.

MR. LEVIN: Reference has been made to these telegrams by the witnesses KAWABE, WACHI and TANAKA, and in view of the fact that these documents are not available we provided a certificate which indicates that they have been -- that they formerly were in the custody of the Chief of the Archives Section and they are not -- and have been burned, and, therefore, they are not available and we cannot produce them.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: Document 1157, your Honor, is not a telegram whereas the other two certificates do refer to telegrams.

THE PRESIDENT: Certificates hitherto have been confined to the nature of a document and not to its absence. That may not be a point that we desire

to take.

BRIGADIFR NOLAN: I only wish to add that in our submission, if such certificates are to be offered there should be some connection between the evidence to which the certificate relates and the certificate.

THE PRESIDENT: I believe the prosecution at one stage tendered a general certificate covering a number of documents thereafter introduced. I think they related to documents from Germany. "ell, these documents are to be introduced later, are they, Mr. Levin? Fvidence relating to these documents is to be introduced later, I take it.

MR. LEVIN: That is my impression, Mr. President. I cannot say for a certainty.

THE PRESIDENT: I think you had better withhold the certificate until the evidence is tendered, if ever.

MR. LEVIN: It was my impression, Mr. President, that these certificates were properly offered, especially in connection with the evidence of the three witnesses who have been on the stand -- three witnesses who have already testified.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the certificates are admitted on the usual terms for what they are worth.

43

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 1157

3 4

2

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

21

22

23

will receive exhibit No. 2492; and document 1158 will be exhibit 2493; and document 1159 will be exhibit No. 2494.

(Whereupon, the documents above referred to were marked defense exhibits Nos. 2492, 2493, and 2494, respectively, and received in evidence.)

MR. LEVIN: Exhibit 2492:

"I hereby certify that, according to our investigation, the document entitled 'Policy for the settlement of the NorthChina Incident,' decided upon on 13 July 1937 was burnt at the time of the end of the war, and that therefore it is not in our custody at present."

Signed YOSHIYAMA, Yozo, Chief frchives Section, 1st Lemobilization Bureau, on the 5th day of April, 1947.

Exhibit 2493: "Certificate.

"I hereby certify that the telegram which was desptached to the Commander of the Japanese Occupation Army in China from the Chief of the General Staff on July 8, 1937, to the effect that the Commander should keep from using armed forces, in order to prevent the spread of the effair, is not preserved in this Bureau, as it has come to light through examination

-

that it was burnt'at the termination of the war.

"Certified at Tokyo, on April 5, 1947.

"YOSHIYAMA, Yozo."

Exhibit 2494: "Certificate.

"I hereby certify that the telegram which was despitched to the Chief of the Staff of the Japanese Occupation Army in China from the Vice-Chief of the General Staff on July 9, 1937, in regard to the Japanese course of action for the negotiations for settling the Lukouchiao Affair, is not preserved in this Bureau as it has come to light through examination that it was burnt at the termination of the war.

"Certified at Tokyo, on April 5, 1947.

"YOSHIYAMA, Yozo."

THE PRESIDENT: Vell, you say these certificates relate to evidence already given. At what page of the record? Look that up tomorrow, will you, Mr. Levin?

MR. LEVIN: I shall do so, Mr. President, and report in the morning.

THE PRESIDENT: If you haven't it now.

MR. LEVIN: I now offer in evidence decument No. 206-D-2, which is an excerpt taken from the Diary of former United States Ambassador Grev.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal, the prosecution objects to defense document 206-D-2 and submits that what Mr. Grew wrote in his diary proves nothing; and, we submit, that the document should be rejected as it has no probative value.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Levin.

MR. LEVIN: This is a statement made from the diary of Mr. Grew and appears in his book, and, it seems to me, it has the same aspect of a report from Mr. Grew which was admitted when presented by the prosecution. I believe in the cross-examination this morning there was some question in relation to whether or not reinforcements had been sent to China, and, this being an official statement of the Ambassador to the United States, it seems to us that it should be admitted in evidence.

If I recall correctly, Nr. President, the prosecution introduced in evidence a statement from -- a statement or report from Mr. Grew in 1937. I think it was exhibit 624 and I think it is found

somewhere about page 694 -- I don't remember the exact page -- which was in my view properly admitted in evidence, but it was because it was a report of the conditions existing in Japan at that time and related to events which were occurring, and a report in connection with the performence of his official duties.

THE PRESIDENT: How do you answer this: This is hearsay on hearsay. It records in Tokyo what was said in Washington of what was happening in Japan or China. That is the actual position isn't it, Mr. Levin? Washington would have got its information from the Japanese Ambassador. If it were a press release in Tokyo we would not have admitted it,

MR. LEVIN: While it has the nature of substance from the fact that Mr. Grew was in Tokyo at the time and that he would naturally gather -get official reports, I would have great difficulty, Mr. President, in offering testimony of this character as a rule, but I do recall that I directed the attention of the Tribunal to the offer by the prosecution of hearsay upon hearsay which was accepted. THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Tribunal

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

high the is night in the new yor have not come

upholds the objection and rejects the document.

MR. LEVIN: We now offer in evidence defense document No. 502, excerpt No. 8, which is taken from the book "Behind the Japanese Mask" by the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Craigie.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

MR. LEVIN: Mr. President, in view of the previous ruling of the Court on this in relation to excerpts from the Craigie book I simply offer it and assume Brigadier Nolan is going to object and we will accept the previous ruling ruling of the Court in relation thereto.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: I do object.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is upheld and the document rejected.

MR. LEVIN: I offer in evidence defense document No. 1098, being a "talk of a Foreign Office official spokesman concerning transportation of military supplies by the Peiping-Hankow Railways."

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadeir Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: The prosecution objects to this document for the same reason that a number of other documents, being press releases, were rejected by the Tribunal.

MR. LEVIN: I submit, Mr. President,
that this document is admissible in evidence. While
it is true this is a talk of a Foreign Office
spokesman, it gives in detail a movement of supplies
and is important in showing the position of both
the Chinese and Japanese armies at that time. This
is a factual statement of an actual movement of
supplies and comes as an official document of the
Japanese Government. It is information of importance
to them and giving it for the mere fact that the
spokesman gave it forth does not reduce its value.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is upheld and the document rejected.

We will adjourn now until half-past nine tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Friday, 25 April 1947, at 0930.)